

JC09 Rec'd PCT/PTO 26 SEP 2005

Re Point V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Reference is made to the following document:
D1: US 2002/141872 A1 (LEE CHING-PANG ET AL) October 3, 2002
2. The present application does not satisfy the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, since the subject matter of claims 1-7 is not based on an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3).
- 2.1 Document D1 is regarded as closest prior art to the subject matter of Claim 1. It discloses (the references in parentheses relate to this document):

a coolable layer system (cf. Figures 2-3), at least comprising a substrate (4) and at least one coating (2, 8) on the substrate (4), cooling passages (10) being used for cooling purposes, the cooling passages (10) at least partially adjoining the coating (2, 8) (cf. Figure 3), and at least two cooling passages (cf. paragraph 0032, lines 12-14) crossing one another, so that the surface which is to be cooled is covered by the cooling passages (10) which cross one another.

The subject matter of Claim 1 therefore differs from the known coolable layer system by virtue of the fact that the cooling passages are arranged in groups that are crosswise with respect to one another.

The object which is to be achieved by the present invention can therefore be regarded as being that of improving the cooling of a layer system.

The solution proposed in Claim 1 of the present application cannot be considered inventive for the following reasons (Article 33(3) PCT):

The arrangement in which the cooling passages are arranged in groups that are crosswise with respect to one another is only one of a number of obvious options from among which the person skilled in the art can select according to circumstances without the need for an inventive step in order to achieve the

object which has been set. Furthermore, D1 gives the person skilled in the art an indication to modify the arrangement described in Document D1 in accordance with the present invention (cf. paragraph 0032, lines 12-14). Therefore, for the person skilled in the art to incorporate this structural measure in the layer system described in Document D1 would be an obvious procedure which is within the scope of standard specialist practice.

- 2.2 Dependent claims 2-7 do not include any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they relate, satisfy the requirements of the PCT with regard to inventive step. The reasons for this are as follows:

The additional features of claims 2-7 are structural arrangements; incorporating these arrangements in the layer system described in Document D1 would be an obvious procedure which is within the scope of standard specialist practice for the person skilled in the art.

3. Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1a)ii) PCT, the description does not mention either the relevant prior art disclosed in Documents D1 and D2 or these documents themselves.